

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

Paranee Sarikaputar, et al.,

Plaintiffs,

-against-

Veratip Corp., et al.,

Defendants.

USDC SDNY
DOCUMENT
ELECTRONICALLY FILED
DOC #: _____
DATE FILED: 06/04/2024

1:19-cv-11168 (ALC) (SDA)

ORDER

STEWART D. AARON, United States Magistrate Judge:

WHEREAS, the parties were required to “submit a proposed notice to be sent to members of the putative collective for the Court's review and approval[,]” (5/3/24 Memo Endorsement, ECF No. 95);¹ and

WHEREAS, the Court reviewed the “Proposed Court Authorized Notice of 29 U.S.C. § 216(b) Collective Action” filed at ECF No. 100-1 (the “Proposed Notice”), which the parties stipulated to but-for a “sole issue” related to inclusion of the names of all Defendants in the Proposed Notice (Pl.’s 5/24/24 Ltr., ECF No. 100); and

WHEREAS, the Court issued an Order to permit the names of all Defendants on the Proposed Notice (5/30/24 Order, ECF No. 102).

NOW, THEREFORE, it is hereby **ORDERED** the Proposed Notice is approved in substantially the same form provided to the Court.²

¹ “Under the FLSA, the content of the notice is left to the court's discretion.” *Delaney v. Geisha N.Y.C., LLC*, 261 F.R.D. 55, 59 (S.D.N.Y. 2009); *accord Lopez v. JVA Indus., Inc.*, No. 14-CV-09988 (KPF), 2015 WL 5052575, at *4 (S.D.N.Y. Aug. 27, 2015) (noting that the FLSA “vests the district court with broad discretion” with respect to the notice of pending litigation to be provided to potential opt-in plaintiffs).

² See *Manfredo v. VIP Auto Grp. Of Long Island, Inc.*, No. 20-CV-03728 (MKB) (AYS), 2021 WL 4958907, at *5 (E.D.N.Y. Oct. 26, 2021) (granting motion for certifying a conditional collective and a proposed notice,

SO ORDERED.

Dated: New York, New York
June 4, 2024



STEWART D. AARON
United States Magistrate Judge

with a few modifications, where the parties stipulated to the proposed notice); *Chowdhury v. Duane Reade, Inc.*, No. 06-CV-02295 (GEL), 2007 WL 2873929, at *6 (S.D.N.Y. Oct. 2, 2007) (“The Court expects the parties to work out those issues on their own, and provide the Court with the stipulated notice.”); *Spencer v. No Parking Today, Inc.*, No. 12-CV-06323 (ALC) (AJP), 2013 WL 1040052, at *28 (S.D.N.Y. Mar. 15, 2013) (directing that a joint proposed notice be submitted to the court for review))